

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Chandy article. The rejection states that the Chandy article is usable under either section 102 (a) or section 102(b). In response, applicants herewith demonstrate 1) that they are entitled to the filing date of the provisional application, thus obtaining the filing date of April 21, 1998, and 2) that even though the authorship on the Chandy article is different than the inventorship, that the Chandy article describes exactly the same subject matter which is claimed herein and therefore that the Chandy article is not "work of another" and therefore is not prior art.

I. In order to demonstrate that the present claims properly receive support from the provisional application, a "claim chart" is provided herein. Moreover, the original provisional did not include page numbers. An exact copy of the original provisional is submitted as an attachment including page numbers, in order to facilitate this comparison.

1. A distributed system framework for a networked environment, including a plurality of process objects, each of said process objects including:

Page 3 of the provisional describes the system framework in second paragraph from the bottom, including describing the personal network that is formed. Page 4, first paragraph, describes the communicating objects or process objects that form the network.

(a) a program method for creating at least one inbox for storing messages received from another process object;

The inboxes are described on page 5, first full paragraph, and also described on page 19, halfway down the page, and also in the figure, and other places throughout the specification.

(b) a program method for creating at least one outbox for storing messages to be transmitted to another process object;

The setup of inboxes is also described on page 5, first full paragraph. The figure on page 19 describes the inboxes and outboxes, and how the outbox stores a message to go to another inbox, see also the top of page 20.

(c) a freeze method that saves the state of the process object to persistent storage, thereby changing the process object to a frozen process object which does not use operating system resources;

The freeze method is described at first on page 5, second paragraph from the bottom, which describes freezing the processes. Page 32 describes further detail on the freeze processes. The section marked 3.2.1 describes how a process in the frozen state does not occupy slots and cannot make use of resources. This section also describes that the frozen state process uses storage space which holds state information. Section 3.2.2 describes how the freeze method stores the state of the process to a persistent store.

(d) a thaw method that restores the frozen process object from the persistent storage, thereby changing the frozen process object to a ready process object;

Thaw method is described in the same places as above. For example, Section 3.2.2 describes a method which restores the process they. Page 33, first paragraph, describes a transition to the ready state.

(e) a program method for interconnecting each created outbox of the process object to a created inbox of at least one other process object, thereby establishing a personal network between the process object and such other process objects within a communication session to perform at least one task by passing messages between the interconnected outboxes and inboxes.

Page 33, Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 describe how the inbox and outbox are interconnected. This is also shown in the figure on page 19. The conceptual model of personal networks is described on page 33. Page 34, last paragraph, describes how a task can start a session that is used to pass messages between the mailboxes.

2. The distributed system framework of claim 1, each process object further including at least one mail daemon object, for controlling the order of messages in each inbox.

Page 52, under the section entitled MailDaemon, describes the MailDaemon that handles the communication layer. One of the things that the MailDaemon is described as dealing is "sorting... messages... in the appropriate mailboxes".

3. The distributed system framework, of claim 1, each process object further including a summary response method, for

instantiating the process object if the process object is summoned by another process object.

Page 78 describes how the process is instantiated on summoning (see, for example, section 4.6, second paragraph).

4. *The distributed system framework of claim 3, wherein the summoning response method causes the thaw method of the process object to be invoked if the process object is frozen when summoned by another process.*

Page 78 also describes how the summon is used along with freeze and thaw. Page 33, first paragraph, also explains that when a process which is frozen is summoned, the summons instantiates and thaws the frozen process to carry out the method to be invoked.

5. *The distributed system framework of claim 1, wherein each message includes a snapshot variable that indicates whether a process object has recorded its state.*

Page 36, under Section 3.5.2, explains the snapshots which determine whether a component's state has been recorded.

6. *The distributed system framework of claim 5, wherein the snapshot variable is a date field, and each process object*

includes a snapshot method that saves the state of the process object if a date field value within a received message is later than an current date value for the process object, updates the current date value for the process object to the date field value of the received message, and increments a clock for the process object to a value exceeding the date field value of the received message.

The values in the message and updating of the message are described in Section 3.5.2.

Based on the above, it should be apparent that the current claims are in fact entitled to the filing date from the parent application, and therefore that the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) has been obviated.

This leaves the rejection under 35 USC 102(a). Applicant herewith provides a declaration from the lead inventor, professor Chandy, declaring that the article is not "work of another". As such, this provides evidence that the reference is not usable under 35 USC 102(a), either. As such, this destroys the prima facie showing of unpatentability.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all of the claim should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Attorney Docket No. 06618-303001
Serial No.: 09/295,957
Amendment dated October 20, 2003

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account

No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/20/03



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10339238.doc